

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

Demonstration Site: Los Angeles County	Reporting Period: Calendar Year <u>2012</u>
County Contact: Name: <u>Jennifer Hottenroth, Assistant Division Chief</u> Phone: <u>562 345-6610</u> Email: <u>hottje@dcfs.lacounty.gov</u>	

Instructions: Pursuant to the legislative requirements for implementing RBS, each county participating in the RBS Demonstration Project shall prepare and submit an annual report. The report is to be developed in collaboration with the private nonprofit agency(ies) participating in the demonstration project. This County Annual Report (CAR) is to be prepared by the county as a single, comprehensive report for the reporting period. The report is prepared for each calendar year in which the RBS Reform Project is in operation and submitted by March 1 of the following year to the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) at RBSreform@dss.ca.gov.

Section A - Client Outcomes:

1. **Complete the table below on the characteristics of the target population served in this reporting period.**

Total Number Of Youth:	Average Age Of Youth:	Number Of Youth Who Are:	Number Of Youth Who Are:	Number Of Youth Placed By:
136	13.4	Male: 117 Female: 19	African-American: 51 American Indian: 1 Asian: 4 Caucasian: 34 Hispanic: 46 Other: 0	Probation: 0 Child Welfare: 136 Mental Health: 0 Other: 0

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report**

Note. Due to licensing issues, only one of the three providers (Hillsides) admits both genders while the rest admit only boys.

- 2. Complete and attach one excel document titled, “RBS Days of Care Schedule” for each RBS provider listing information for each youth enrolled in RBS since implementation of the project. This document captures information on the total days in care in residential, community-based bridge care, after-care and crisis stabilization, beginning with the youth’s initial enrollment in RBS.**
- a. For those youth who were both active in RBS during the reporting period and enrolled in RBS long enough to meet or exceed the approved site target for average length of stay in group home residential placement, what percent exceeded the site target for average length of stay in group home residential placement and by an average of how many days?**

The RBS program in Los Angeles County was set-up so that clients have up to 9 months of care in residential with an additional month of respite built in to help with the transition to the community phase. The RBS residential rate drops after 10 months of care in residential. For youth who were both active in RBS during the reporting period and enrolled in RBS long enough to meet or exceed the approved site target for average length of stay in group home residential placement, overall, the youth remained within the average length of stay.

- b. For those youth who exited (for any reason) from the RBS program during the reporting period, what percent exceeded the approved site target for average length of stay in the full RBS program (residential plus community) and by an average of how many days?**

For youth that exited the RBS program, the total average percentage for the three RBS provider agencies indicates no exceeding of the approved site target for average length of stay in the full RBS program.

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report**

- c. What number and percent of youth stepped down from group home residential placement to a lower level of care during the reporting period? Of those youth who stepped down, what number and percent returned to group home residential care? For any youth who stepped down to a lower level of care and returned to group home residential care multiple times, describe the number of youth and the reasons for each movement up and down in level of care.**

For the three RBS service provider agencies, on average 35 youth (which represents 45% of the RBS service provider agencies' youth population) stepped down from group home residential care to a lower level of care during the current reporting period. Of those youth who stepped down to lower level of care, six (6) youth (17%) returned to group home residential care.

The following are reasons cited by the three RBS service providers for the above six youths' re-entry to group home residential care:

- The first youth returned home with mother who was residing in a sober living facility for families, and had behavioral escalation resulting in the sober living facility no longer allowing the youth to live there. As a result, the youth was returned to residential care;
- A second youth who had returned home with father was returned to group home care after the youth's father got into a domestic dispute with his ex-wife which resulted in father's arrest;
- A third youth who had been in a foster home for hearing impaired had a behavioral escalation which exceeded the caregiver's ability to continue providing care to youth;
- A fourth youth returned to residential care because of domestic violence in the home;
- A fifth youth returned to residential care because there were issues regarding the potential adoptive caregiver resulting in the court order to return the youth to residential care;
- A sixth youth had transitioned to a foster home, but youth's behavior continued to escalate and caregiver decided not to proceed forward with continued care for the youth.

- d. Of those youth active in RBS during the reporting period, what number and percent exited from RBS due to graduation, emancipation, voluntary closure, and other (as defined by "Current Status Code" in the RBS Days of Care Schedule)? Of those exiting as "other", describe the reasons for disenrollment.**

Los Angeles County RBS service provider agencies (Five Acres, Hathaway-Sycamores and Hillsides) reported that a total of 33 (24%) of youth graduated from

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

RBS.

None of the RBS youth emancipated from the RBS service provider agencies during this reporting period.

None of the RBS service providers reported any RBS youth who exited due to voluntary closure.

Of those exiting RBS as “other”, the following are reasons for disenrollment:

- Juvenile detention;
- Youth AWOL;
- Severity of Youth’s behavior;
- Youth refused to participate;
- County social worker’s decision;
- RBS provider agency capacity issues;
- System barriers;
- RBS funding switched over to AAP.

e. Of those youth who exited from RBS since implementation of the RBS program, what number and percent re-enrolled in RBS during this reporting period?

Los Angeles County RBS service provider agencies (Five Acres, Hathaway-Sycamores and Hillside) reported that a total of 53 youth exited from the RBS program and two youth (3.8%) re-enrolled in RBS during this reporting period.

f. What percent of youth utilized crisis stabilization services during the reporting period? Of those youth, what was the average number of episodes of crisis stabilization per youth? List the reasons why the crisis stabilization episode occurred:

Twenty-point-six percent (20.6%) of youth utilized crisis stabilization for the three RBS service provider agencies in 2012. Of these youth, the average number of episodes of crisis stabilization per youth for the three RBS provider agencies is 2.6 episodes.

The following are reasons for crisis stabilization episodes:

- Youth are not following staff/caregiver direction;
- Youth refusing to go to school;
- Crisis situations involving safety and risk behavior issues in the home such as unsafe behaviors, physical and verbal aggression, and property destruction.

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

Section B - Client Involvement:

1. **Using the Child and Adolescence Needs and Strengths (CANS) data provided by Walter R. McDonald and Associates, Inc. (WRMA), address the following:**
 - a. **Describe any trends indicated by the CANS data.**

The results of CANS data from WRMA are only descriptive average scores in each domain (based on scores that range from 0-30, with lower scores indicating lower levels of need). Because no tests of statistical significance were conducted, trends cannot be sufficiently concluded from the CANS Domain Summary Scores. Additionally, the data represent only those clients who were still active in 2012, but from different entry cohorts—some RBS clients, who have 24-month follow-ups, are grouped together with other clients who may have just recently enrolled and only have baseline measurements. One major concern with interpretation of these summary scores is the issue of censoring/attrition: i.e., later follow-up scores may only reflect those cases still enrolled while missing data from clients who have left the program (for example, through disenrollments) are not represented. This may artificially skew the data to show a particular trend when one actually does not exist (if data from all cohorts were available for analysis). Therefore, the interpretations provided below should be cautiously interpreted as more advanced statistical methods (e.g., multilevel linear modeling or survival analysis) are required to appropriately conclude what trends, if any, are present.

From baseline measurements at RBS enrollment through four follow-up periods (each at 6-month intervals after enrollment), the average CANS scores across six domains, if statistically significant, suggest possible decreases in need over time. These six domains are: Functional status, Mental Health, Risk Behaviors, Child Strengths, Child Safety, and Educational Progress. The other domains (Substance Use Complications, Family/Caregiver Needs and Strengths, and Relationship Permanence) show relatively low average levels of need based on the CANS score range, at later follow-up measurements.

- b. **Can any conclusions be made from the data? If yes, what are they? If no, why not?**

[] Yes [X] No Explain:

As described above, no conclusions can be derived from these simple summary scores of CANS domains aggregated across different entry-cohorts, without significance testing, and without consideration of missing data at later follow-ups (as would be included in survival analyses). At the very least, the summary scores indicate that RBS clients start with CANS needs—at baseline—no worse than midway in the measurement scale (i.e., no average baseline score is greater than 15, which is the

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

median for the 0-30 needs scale). However, no conclusion can be drawn about whether the needs scale scores significantly decrease over time in RBS.

Because no statistical significance in any of the averages can be determined, we cannot be sure if any differences measured in the CANS are reliable. For this reason, I don't think we can make any clear inferences on the progress from the CANS results, even though the averages are lower at later measurements than initial ones.

2. a. Complete the table below on family and youth participation in child/family team meetings during the reporting period.

Total Number Of Youth:	Total Number Of Youth With At Least One Supportive Adult During Any Part Of The Reporting Period:	Number Of Youth Participating In At Least 90% Of Their Child/Family Team Meetings:	Number Of Youth With At Least One Supportive Adult Participating In At Least 90% Of That Youth's Child/Family Team Meetings:
136	126	115	94

b. If youth did not participate, explain why not.

Reasons for youth that did not participate:

- Youth refused to participate;
- Youth AWOLed;
- It is challenging to have some of the younger participants attend the CFT meeting and remain focused throughout the meeting.

Section C - Client Satisfaction:

1. Using the Youth Services Survey for Youth (YSS) and Youth Services Survey for Families (YSS-F) data provided by WRMA, specifically satisfaction measured in Items 1-15 of the YSS and YSS-F and outcomes measured in Items 16-22 of the YSS and YSS-F, address the following:

a. Describe any trends in the data.

No trends in average satisfaction scores on YSS or YSS-F instruments can be concluded. Average satisfaction scores range between 3.7 and 4.5 across all three domains for YSS and YSS-F instruments, based on a 5-point scale (higher scores indicate higher satisfaction). This indicates generally higher than median satisfaction among the relatively small sample (n = 11 for YSS; n = 6 for YSS-F) who completed

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

both follow-up surveys. These results should be cautiously interpreted, however, due to the very small sample size, the amount of attrition of participants over measurement intervals, and (as with the preceding CANS analysis) the aggregation of entry cohorts.

- b. Can any conclusions be made from the data? If yes, what are they? If no, why not?**

[] Yes [X] No Explain:

The analyses reported by WRMA are based on baseline, and two follow-up periods (which does not match the number of follow-up periods reported for the CANS) of youth who were active in 2012. A noteworthy smaller sample of participants completed YSS (n = 39) and YSS-F (n = 32) at baseline compared to the CANS (n = 65). It is unclear what accounts for this disparity in sample sizes; it is also unclear what accounts for the significant attrition at later follow-up measurements (e.g., YSS surveys drop off by n = 14 from baseline to Follow-Up 1, then another n = 14 from Follow-Up 1 to Follow-Up 2). As with the CANS analyses, no significance testing was conducted. However, it is unlikely that any significant changes in YSS or YSS-F scores would be found anyhow as scores for each of the three domains show very small differences (e.g., no more than .4 points on YSS-F Well Being domain with baseline = 4.2 and follow-up 2 = 3.8).

Similar to concerns noted with the CANS summary scores, appropriate statistical methods to account for the special needs of these longitudinal data need to be applied to the YSS and YSS-F before hypotheses salient to the RBS model can be tested. Due to small sample sizes, however, any conclusions drawn from these data—regardless of analytical method—are quite limited.

Section D - County and Provider Use of RBS Program:

- 1. a. During the reporting period, has the operation of the program significantly changed from the original design described in the approved plan? If yes, describe the change.**

[] Yes [X] No Explain:

- b. If yes, how has this adaptation impacted the effectiveness of the project?**

N/A

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report**

2. During the reporting period, have there been any significant differences from the roles and responsibilities delineated in the approved plan for the various county agencies and provider(s)? If yes, describe the differences.

☐ Yes ☒ No Explain:

3. Were RBS enrollments sufficient during the reporting period? If not, why not?

☐ Yes ☒ No Explain:

Generally, the enrollments were sufficient during the reporting period. However, one of the three RBS provider agencies reported that it is particularly challenging to fill open RBS slots.

Challenges in maintaining adequate enrollment include the following: one of the RBS service provider agencies specifically serves youth who have behavioral issues (such as chronic AWOL and substance abuse), many are classified as RCL 14, are comparatively older, have experienced multiple out-of-home placements, have longer periods in an out-of-home setting, referrals for the residential program are all level 14 youth so there are fewer opportunities for the agency to self-refer from existing youth, and/or are likely to be under dual DCFS and Probation supervision with possibility of becoming wards of Probation (602).

4. Describe how the county and provider(s) managed RBS staff resources during the reporting period (e.g., filling vacancies, redefining job qualifications, eliminating positions, etc.)

DCFS and DMH continue to allocate needed resources to support RBS and have demonstrated a strong collaboration and desire to see RBS succeed. DCFS and DMH have maintained a strong RBS administration that works closely with the three RBS service providers, regional DCFS staff, and management to maintain the smooth operation of RBS.

One of the RBS provider agencies reported experiencing challenges in keeping the bilingual Spanish Parent Partner positions, and also maintaining an adequate number of Parent Partners.

One of the RBS agencies reported that the agency has given some Child and Family Specialists additional responsibilities that initially were being done by the Milieu Supervisor. By doing that, the agency Milieu Supervisor can be involved significantly with team planning, and attending Child and Family Team meetings, etc.

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

One of the RBS provider agencies implemented flexible use of existing Parent Partners to provide additional support in Family Finding, so that existing Family Finding staff have more time to serve families.

Section E - County Payments to Nonprofit Agency(ies):

Note: The payments reported here are from the county records as recorded on a cash basis during the reporting period from January 1 to December 31, for all providers participating in the RBS demonstration project.

1. For Questions a through c, please complete the table below:
 - a. Report the total payments from all fund sources paid to the provider(s) for RBS during the period the report covers under each of the following:
 - Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care (AFDC-FC). (The amounts reported here should come from the amount reported under H1, amount claimed per fiscal tracking sheet. They will not be equal because H1 is cumulative for the project and F1 is only for the reporting year.)
 - Early, Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT).
 - Mental Health Services Act (MHSA).
 - Grants, loans, other. (Itemize any amounts reported by source.)
 - b. Provide the Average Months of Stay in Group Care for all children/youth enrolled in group home care during the reporting period.
 - c. Provide the Average Months of Stay in Community Care for all children/youth enrolled in community services (not in group home) during the reporting period.

	AFDC-FC	EPSDT	MHSA	Other	Total
Amount Paid for Residential	\$5,394,748.00	\$2,505,859.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$9,354,289.00
Amount Paid for Community	\$1,718,762.00	\$2,424,248.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,638,933.00
Total Amount Paid	\$7,113,510.00	\$4,930,107.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$12,993,222.00
Avg. Length of Stay in Residential	7.7 Months	7.7 Months	—	—	—
Avg. Length of Stay in Community	7.4 Months	7.4 Months	—	—	—
Avg. AFDC-FC Payment Per Youth in Residential	\$67,141.47	\$24,567.25	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$91,708.72
Avg. AFDC-FC Payment per Youth in Community	\$15,982.69	\$31,898.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$47,880.69

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report**

2. Were any changes made to the Funding Model in order to manage payment shortfalls/overages, incentives, refunds during the reporting period? If yes, explain what the changes were and why they were needed.

☐ Yes ☒ No Explain:

Section F - Actual Costs of Nonprofit Agency(ies):

Note: The amounts reported here should be based on each provider's accounting records for RBS for the period from January 1 through December 31, and be on a basis consistent with the method used to report costs on the annual A-133 Financial Audit Report and SR3 document filed with CDSS.

1. a. For residential costs, complete the table below displaying provider actual costs during the reporting period, compared to the RBS proposed budget included in the approved Funding Model. If there is more than one provider in the demonstration project, combine the individual provider data into one table for the project.

Note: This chart follows the SR-3 financial report. Definitions are listed in the instructions (RBS Letter No. 04-11, dated August 16, 2011).

RBS Residential costs for the three RBS service provider agencies:

Expenditures:	Proposed Budget for the Period	Actuals for the Period	Over/(Under) Budget
Total Salaries & Benefits	\$2,777,699.00	\$2,407,404.00	(\$370,295.00)
Total Operating Costs	\$900,711.00	\$926,556.00	\$25,845.00
Total Child Care & Supervision Costs	\$1,027,476.00	\$1,646,674.00	\$619,199.00
Total Mental Health Treatment Services Costs	\$2,219,704.00	\$1,796,751.00	(\$422,953.00)
Total Social Work Activity, Treatment & Family Support Costs	\$477,010.00	\$241,271.00	(\$235,738.00)
Total Indirect Costs	\$680,626.00	\$774,018.00	\$93,392.00
Total Expenditures	\$8,083,226.00	\$7,792,674.00	(\$290,552.00)

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report**

- b. Does the difference between the actual provider costs and the proposed budget exceed 5 percent on any line item above? If yes, explain what caused the variance and whether this difference is expected to be temporary or permanent.**

[X] Yes [] No Explain:

The "Total Expenditures" figure shows that the difference between the actual provider costs and the proposed budget exceed 5%. The variance between the budgeted amount and the actual cost appears to be temporary and related to some of the RBS agencies continued attempt to learn about the right mix of staffing levels to appropriately serve youth and families. RBS service provider agencies project that they will be at full capacity all the time; adjustments in the staff level of the RBS service provider agencies have been made when agencies were not in full capacity. In addition, one of the RBS service provider agencies reported that client referrals are below budgeted census.

- 2. a. For community costs, complete the table below displaying provider actual costs during the reporting period, compared to the RBS proposed budget included in the approved Funding Model. If there is more than one provider in the demonstration project, combine the individual provider data into one table for the project.**

Note: This chart follows the SR-3 financial report. Definitions are listed in the instructions (RBS Letter No. 04-11, dated August 16, 2011).

RBS Community costs for the three RBS service provider agencies:

Expenditures:	Proposed Budget for the Period	Actuals for the Period	Over/(Under) Budget
Total Salaries & Benefits	\$1,645,648.00	\$1,043,324.00	(\$602,324.00)
Total Operating Costs	\$951,797.00	\$164,624.00	(\$787,173.00)
Total Child Care & Supervision Costs	\$200,000.00	\$70,666.00	(\$129,334.00)
Total Mental Health Treatment Services Costs	\$1,734,101.00	\$866,525.00	(\$867,576.00)
Total Social Work Activity, Treatment & Family Support Costs	\$983,165.00	\$322,164.00	(\$661,001.00)
Total Indirect Costs	\$498,330.00	\$365,971.00	(\$132,359.00)
Total Expenditures	\$6,013,041.00	\$2,833,274.00	(\$3,179,767.00)

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report**

- b. Does the difference between the actual provider costs and the proposed budget exceed 5 percent on any line item above? If yes, explain what caused the variance and whether this difference is expected to be temporary or permanent.**

[x] Yes [] No Explain:

Client referrals are below budgeted census which impacts the number in the community as well as residential. Clients being referred to RBS require a higher level of care, which in turn impacts the number of clients transitioning to community.

The client base for one of the three RBS service provider agencies is much older making it challenging to successfully place these particular clientele in the Community – due to lack of bridge care options (Foster Family Agency/Intensive Treatment Foster Care (ITFC)).

RBS agencies continue to learn about the right mix of staff needed to appropriately serve the youth.

These challenges appear to be temporary in that RBS service provider agencies, County RBS managers and RBS Training and Social Marketing committee are actively working to increase referrals, promote RBS and impress upon frontline children's social workers, supervisors and managers that RBS should be the placement of choice when it is likely that a youth might be placed in congregate care like setting. In addition, County RBS managers are working with placement resource specialists such as Intensive Treatment Foster Care (ITFC), Permanency Partners Program (P3) and Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) managers (for faster home clearances) to increase the rate of timely transition to bridge care.

- 3. Were there extraordinary costs associated with any particular child/youth (i.e., outliers as defined in the Funding Model)? If yes, provide the amount of the cost and describe what it purchased.**

[X] Yes [] No Explain:

One of the three RBS service provider agencies incurred significant costs associated with a particular youth who transitioned to Oakland, California. The agency utilized flex funds for the Youth Specialist, Facilitator, Parent Partner and Clinician to take turns in accompanying the youth to Northern California to relocate the youth closer to the youth's biological mother. This amounted to \$6,365.00 in total incurred expenses by the agency.

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report**

One of the three RBS service provider agencies utilized flex funds to help a youth connect to his maternal grandmother so that they can establish relationships which would lead to an eventual placement. Incurred expenses include the cost of air-fare, car rental, hotel, incidentals and meals. This amounted to \$8,570.00 in total incurred expenses by the agency.

4. Has the county performed the fiscal audit required by the memorandum of understanding? If yes, describe any problems/issues with the provider's operations or implementation of the Funding Model that were disclosed by the fiscal audit performed. If no, when will that audit occur?

[X] Yes [] No Explain:

There were issues with the provider's operations or implementation of the Funding Model that were disclosed by the fiscal audit performed. The three RBS service provider agencies did not complete the Time Study and the ACHSA statements in July, 2012:

- The three RBS service provider agencies did not include the RBS specific audited costs in their Audited Financial Statements and Single Audit Reports;
- The three RBS service provider agencies did not clearly identify the RBS program expenditures for the residential and community components; and
- The three RBS service provider agencies did not provide supporting documentation for all RBS expenses.

At least one of the RBS service provider agency has submitted a response to the Los Angeles County Auditor Controller challenging the preliminary audit finding that no Time Study was completed. The Los Angeles County DCFS RBS Program has sent out official letters to the RBS service provider agencies asking for a Corrective Action Plan to the Auditor Controller's findings detailed above. At least one RBS service provider has submitted its time study after the fiscal audit by Auditor Controller.

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

Section G - Impact on AFDC-FC Costs:

1. This is a cumulative report from the beginning of the project. Amounts reported are based on the amounts included in the claim presented to CDSS. Using the RBS claim fiscal tracking sheets, please complete the information below for all children served by RBS from the start of the project to the end of the reporting period:

RBS Payments for All Children Enrolled in RBS from the start of the project through the end of the Reporting Period:

Total Children Served In RBS: 136	Total:	Federal:	State:	County:
Federal Payments:				
Residential:	\$6,848,430.00	\$ 2,431,670.00	\$1,119,568.00	\$ 3,297,192.00
Community:	\$1,214,685.00	\$152,380.00	\$400,711.00	\$661,594.00
Total Federal Payments:	\$8,063,115.00			
Non-federal Payments:				
Residential:	\$4,369,451.00	\$0	\$1,372,394.00	\$2,997,057.00
Community:	\$853,055.00	\$0	\$322,134.00	\$530,921.00
Total Non-federal Payments:	\$5,222,506.00			
Total RBS Payments	\$13,285,621.00			

Note: It is possible to have federal funds used in the Non-federal Payment (i.e., non-federal RBS children) category. These payments would be the federal share of any Emergency Assistance Funding used in the RBS program up to the first 12 months of a child's stay in RBS. The amounts reported would come from the non-federal fiscal tracking sheet, and are based on the instructions provided in RBS Letter No. 03-11, dated June 21, 2011.

2. Of the children reported in G1 above, please complete the information below for all children who successfully entered and exited RBS in 24 months, or remained in RBS for a full 24 months.

Note: When completing G2, it is important to understand how G2, G3, and G4 work to form the comparison to regular AFDC-FC costs. Section G4 is a comparison of cost for those children who have completed RBS (from G2) to the cost of regular foster care based on the target group base period (G3). In this context, a child "completing RBS" is

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

one who has either entered the program and then exited after successfully completing his/her RBS program goal, or one who has entered the program and remained in the program longer than the base period (24 months). The comparison in Section G4 is done only for those children who have successfully completed the RBS program goal or are still in the program at the 24 month mark. The count of children for Section G2 and the related costs are only for those children who have completed the RBS program or remained in RBS longer than 24 months. For example, a child entering RBS who remains in the program for only 3 months and then is disenrolled would not be included in G2. A child entering RBS and still in the program at month 26 would be included in G2.

RBS Payments for all Children Entering and Exiting RBS in the 24 month Period or remaining in the program for longer than 24 months. (Include all children meeting this condition from the beginning of the project.):

Total Children Completing RBS: 33

Total:	Federal:	State:	County:
--------	----------	--------	---------

Federal Payments:

Residential:

\$537,179.00	\$214,866.00	\$85,947.00	\$236,366.00
--------------	--------------	-------------	--------------

Community:

\$527,747.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$527,747.00
--------------	--------	--------	--------------

Total Federal Payments:

\$1,064,926.00

Non-federal Payments:

Residential:

\$479,517.00	\$0.00	\$153,441.00	\$326,076.00
--------------	--------	--------------	--------------

Community:

\$456,662.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$456,662.00
--------------	--------	--------	--------------

Total Non-federal Payments:

\$936,179.00

Total RBS Payments:

\$2,001,105.00

- 3. Using the approved Attachment A from the Funding Model and the number of children reported in G2 (above), complete the information below regarding the expected base Foster Care costs for RBS target population children that otherwise would have been served in Foster Care.**

Note: Since Section G3 of the CAR is used to compare the base AFDC-FC rates had the RBS youth remained in regular foster care, the "Approved Base Rate Per Child" is the weighted average of AFDC-FC payments for Rate Classification Level (RCL) 12 and RCL 14 placements as described and approved in the Funding Model. The "Approved Base Months in Regular Foster Care" section is the approved comparison length for the RBS youth had they remained in regular foster care. For all RBS counties, the approved base months in regular foster care is 24 months, based on the demographic for the

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

current length of stay in a group home for the target group. The "Applicable Federal Funds Rate" is the percentage of federal funds rate based on the federal medical assistance percentage (FMAP) used in the RBS claim. The CAR template has this FMAP funding rate pre-loaded at 50 percent because all of the RBS Funding Models used the pre-American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) FMAP rate of 50 percent for approval purposes. However, because Section G1 of the CAR instructs counties to use financial costs based on the RBS Fiscal Tracking sheets, counties must use the ARRA rate in effect for that month and quarter. For the months through and including December 2010, the ARRA rate is 56.2 percent. For the months beginning January 2011, the ARRA rate will decline until it reaches 50 percent beginning July 2011. Details on the ARRA rates used in the RBS claim are in an RBS claim letter. In order to produce a correct comparison of costs between sections G1, G2, and G3, whatever federal funds rate is used in Section G1 should be the same rate used for G2 and G3.

Note: If zero have completed, enter zero for this reporting period comparison.

AFDC-FC Base for Comparison:

Approved Base Rate Per Child:	\$ 6138.00	(from H2, above)
Number of Children Completing RBS:	33	
Approved Base Months in Regular Foster Care:	24	
Applicable Federal Funds Rate:	50%	

	Total	Federal	State	County
Base Payment for Target Group:	\$4,861,296.00	\$2,430,648.00	\$972,259.20	\$1,458,388.80

4. a. For those children who have completed the RBS program, using the information from G2 and G3 above, subtract G3 from G2 and complete the following information:

	Total	Federal	State	County
RBS Incremental Cost/(Savings)Based On Program Completion:	\$2,860,191.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,860,191.00

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report**

b. What aspects of operating RBS contributed to the cost/savings compared to regular Foster Care?

Compared to regular foster care, RBS provides therapeutic and rehabilitative services on the front end and incorporates informal support as the RBS youth progresses, thereby helping the youth self-regulate many of the behavioral challenges that initially manifested. The utilization of Family Finding services help the RBS youth, assist in identifying people who have made significant impact in the child's life and possibly assist in the youth's continued progress and eventual transition to bridge care. The above factors may result in shorter duration of stay in residential care as compared to children who remain in regular Foster Care, which in turn contribute to the savings.

5. Has EPSDT usage changed when compared with the typical usage by similar children/youth in traditional foster care? If yes, explain how it's different.

☐ Yes ☒ No Explain:

6. Has MHSA usage changed when compared with the typical usage by similar children/youth in traditional foster care? If yes, explain how it's different.

N/A

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

Section H - Lessons Learned:

1. Describe the most significant program lessons learned and best practices applied during the reporting period.

- Resources for youth to transition to the community after residential care are insufficient. The capacity of Bridge Care in Los Angeles County cannot meet the demand of youth that may not have a permanency option but do not require intensive mental health support of residential care;
- Encourage participation by County Staff in Child and Family Team Meetings;
- Submit ASFA in a timely manner. Timely submission of application and quicker ASFA approval will result in better outcomes for our children and families;
- RBS Family Finding Process involvement such as Permanency Planning Partners (P3) would greatly assist in transitioning an RBS youth from residential care to community care in a timely manner;
- Managing data and data tracking can be time-consuming and cumbersome. Also, inputting of RBS Special Project Code: at the current time, more than one person has access to CWS/CMS. If one of the parties with access to CWS/CMS terminates a case on CWS/CMS before the County RBS Data Coordinator enters RBS related information and service termination dates for the child, the intended benefits of the tracking system are compromised in that the County RBS Data Coordinator will no longer be able to make any changes, corrections, or document changes related to the services for the child.

2. Describe the most significant fiscal lessons learned and best practices applied during the reporting period.

- RBS clients have up to 9 months of care in residential with an additional month of respite built in to help with the transition to the community phase. The RBS residential rate drops after 10 months of care in residential. Some RBS youth will inevitably exceed the average length of stay and providers are concerned that if youth remain stuck in residential, the rate would drop to \$4,184 and the agency fiscal standing would be impacted as a result;
 - County RBS team tracks RBS youth at the 6-month, 9-month and 10-month mark and discusses about service provision, barriers to transition and available placement resources at every monthly Open Doors Roundtable meeting. The same list is shared along with the progress and updates on each RBS youth with the Executive Assistant to the Director of DCFS.

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report**

- Tracking overpayment and underpayment is time-consuming and requires close collaboration with providers, County fiscal staff, Eligibility Workers, Revenue Enhancement staff, BIS, ISD and line staff;
 - This has been an ongoing problem since our last reporting (RBS CAR 2011) and Los Angeles County Department of Children and Family Services Business Information Systems (BIS) has developed and continues to utilize RBS 9 and 10 month residential placement E-mail alerts that are sent out to regional office social worker, RBS staff and management. In addition, Los Angeles County has met with BIS managers and proposed a draft architecture to develop a more robust RBS and Wraparound case tracking system, which may take some time to develop due to the current shortage of application developers (compared to the need) in the Department.
- The composite nature of the RBS funding model and funding source makes it more challenging for most RBS team member to understand RBS payment flows.
 - Los Angeles County DCFS RBS management s working closely and meeting regularly with DCFS Fiscal Division to troubleshoot some of the challenges faced during our last RBS CAR reporting period and reach mutual understanding about payment flows.

COUNTY OF Los Angeles

List the youth who have been admitted to your RBS program since implementation and show how they have moved through the various stages of your program thus far (e.g. from the residential group care component, to "bridge" foster care, to reunification or another form of permanency).

Non-Profit Corp. Name: Hillsides **Program Number:** 09-021-02 **Contact Person:** Grayson Kelso
Period Covered: Activity through..... 12/31/2012 **Telephone Number:** 323-254-2274 **Date Completed:** 1/8/2012

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	
Youth Enrolled		RBS Residential Group Care				RBS Community-Based "Bridge" Foster Care						RBS Aftercare in Permanent Placement, including Reunification				CURRENT STATUS			
Use Youth's Foreign Client Key Only; List in order of Date of Admission		Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Group Care, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In "Bridge" Foster Care, Total Days To Date	Number of RBS "Bridge" Foster Care Placements To Date	Did Child Incur Episodes For Crisis Stabilization?	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Aftercare or a Permanent Care Total Days To Date	Use Current Status Codes Below	For CLOSED Cases ONLY, Total Days In RBS	For OPEN Cases ONLY, Total Days In RBS	
1	JpoenMD5pX	12/2/2010	2/16/2011	76	-	2/16/2011	10/17/2012	609	-						-		4	685	-
2	0s4x08H7Ql	12/2/2010	11/11/2011	344	-	11/11/2011	2/16/2012	97	-						-		6	441	-
3	EflbP3T7Ql	12/2/2010		-	760			-	-						-		1	-	760
4	9zjbY2R8Jb	12/2/2010	7/19/2012	595	-			-	-						-		6	595	-
5	LS2QRP21Kr	12/2/2010	2/7/2012	432	-			-	-						-		6	432	-
6	4cTtdQY19I	12/2/2010	11/3/2011	336	-	11/3/2011	2/3/2012	92	-						-		4	428	-
7	DzvTzoA19I	12/2/2010	9/21/2011	293	-			-	-			9/21/2011	11/15/2012	421	-		4	714	-
8	OK1Hnj2COn	12/2/2010	5/16/2012	531	-	5/16/2012		229	-						-		2	-	760
9	T307HEK5Ds	12/2/2010	10/20/2011	322	-	10/20/2011	2/22/2012	125	-						-		6	447	-
10	2OQdWuA7Yt	12/2/2010		-	760			-	-						-		1	-	760
11	TI8arFo5GV	12/2/2010	12/20/2011	383	-	12/20/2011		377	-						-		2	-	760
12	Dghflsn5nH	12/2/2010	7/21/2011	231	-	7/21/2011	7/2/2012	347	-						-		4	578	-
13	EdAyvUL85d	12/2/2010	12/7/2011	370	-	12/7/2011		390	-						-		2	-	760
14	9LuumHfClF	2/17/2011		-	683			-	-						-		1	-	683
15	9A0YFY05GV	6/19/2011	12/20/2011	184	-	12/20/2011	10/2/2012	287	-						-		4	471	-
16	IoIrtZTSbm4	6/21/2011	3/2/2012	255	-			-	-			3/2/2012			304	-	3	-	559
17	8IvRQR55Cm	7/20/2011	11/15/2011	118	-	11/15/2011	7/13/2012	241	-						-		1	-	530
17	8IvRQR55Cm	7/13/2012		-	171			-	-						-		1	-	530
18	72hOr9B6uS	7/28/2011	5/1/2012	278	-			-	-			5/1/2012			244	-	3	-	522
19	CpFMJ8g5Dg	9/28/2011		-	460			-	-						-		1	-	460
20	23g8uXa0Kk	10/17/2011	6/29/2012	256	-	6/29/2012		185	-						-		2	-	441
21	6CrwkTJ6Zt	10/26/2011	8/3/2012	282	-	8/3/2012		150	-						-		2	-	432
22	DWbRqvk6Zz	10/24/2011	9/7/2012	319	-	9/7/2012		115	-						-		2	-	434
23	90VaAHM1VV	11/4/2011	4/13/2012	161	-			-	-			4/13/2012	9/14/2012	154	-		4	315	-
24	KcXDXs35DQ	11/16/2011	6/1/2012	198	-	6/1/2012		69	-						-		1	-	411
24	KcXDXs35DQ	8/9/2012		-	144			-	-						-		1	-	411
25	GQKLW6M5yN	12/1/2011	7/13/2012	225	-			-	-			7/13/2012			171	-	3	-	396
26	2vHZqsl5Ch	12/9/2011	8/7/2012	242	-			-	-						-		6	242	-
27	G0mhyeV5Ch	12/20/2011	8/6/2012	230	-			-	-			8/6/2012	10/31/2012	86	-		4	316	-
28	NIBSF8n6wL	12/20/2011	8/6/2012	230	-	8/6/2012		67	-						-		1	-	377
28	NIBSF8n6wL	10/12/2012		-	80			-	-						-		1	-	377
29	5wlr2Co5px	2/8/2012	6/15/2012	128	-			-	-			6/15/2012	8/14/2012	60	-		6	188	-
30	1wyEOR3Egm	3/2/2012		-	304			-	-						-		1	-	304
31	D3XmE349Zp	3/19/2012	9/14/2012	179	-	9/14/2012		108	-						-		2	-	287
32	MV1VYk80Z6	4/16/2012		-	259			-	-						-		1	-	259
33	AHvIQB01a7	5/11/2012		-	234			-	-						-		1	-	234
34	37sPhyXB3n	6/6/2012		-	208			-	-						-		1	-	208
35	DnUVru0FMr	6/18/2012	10/24/2012	128	-			-	-			10/24/2012			68	-	3	-	196
36	U761Fc15sq	7/23/2012		-	161			-	-						-		1	-	161
37	7TwyvZe0Yt	8/6/2012		-	147			-	-						-		1	-	147
38	BUxea9uAh5	8/10/2012		-	143			-	-						-		1	-	143
39	lJkZL4p1Eh	8/9/2012		-	144			-	-						-		1	-	144
40	3jDEOVA1VV	8/9/2012		-	144			-	-						-		1	-	144
41	LhEucv25GR	9/17/2012		-	105			-	-						-		1	-	105
42	SL1EmZg5DT	10/4/2012		-	88			-	-						-		1	-	88
43	5DKco3w5EE	10/25/2012		-	67			-	-						-		1	-	67

Current Status Codes:

- 1 RBS Case Open with Youth in Residential Group Care
- 2 RBS Case Open with Youth in "Bridge" Foster Care
- 3 RBS Case Open with Youth in Permanent Placement with RBS Aftercare Services
- 4 RBS Case Closed: Graduation
- 5 RBS Case Closed: Exit before Graduation due to Emancipation
- 6 RBS Case Closed: Exit before Graduation for Reason other than Emancipation
- 7 RBS Case Closed: Voluntary Closure
- 8 RBS Case Closed: AB 3632 Eligibility Ends

COUNTY OF Los Angeles

List the youth who have had a Crisis Stabilization episode during the report period and show the number of days in each placement per episode. (The total number of days a client spends in Crisis Stabilization runs concurrently and is included in the total number of days in the Community component the youth was in when the Crisis Stabilization episode occurred).

Non-Profit Corp. Name: Hillsides Program Number: 09-021-02 Contact Person: Grayson Kelso
 Period Covered: Activity through..... 12/31/2012 Telephone Number: 323-254-2274 Date Completed: 1/8/2012

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R
Youth Enrolled		#1 RBS CRISIS STABILIZATION PLACEMENT				#2 RBS CRISIS STABILIZATION PLACEMENT				#3 RBS CRISIS STABILIZATION PLACEMENT				#4 RBS CRISIS STABILIZATION PLACEMENT			
Use Youth's Foreign Client Key Only; List in order of Date of Admission		Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Crisis Stabilization, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Crisis Stabilization, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Crisis Stabilization, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Crisis Stabilization, Total Days To Date
1	OK1HnJ2COn	12/31/2012	1/6/2013	6	-			-	-			-	-			-	-
2	T307HEK5Ds	1/24/2012	2/5/2012	12	-	2/6/2012	2/22/2012	16	-			-	-			-	-
3	Ti8arFo5GV	3/12/2012	3/25/2012	13	-	7/2/2012	7/15/2012	13	-	7/18/2012	8/1/2012	14	-	12/4/2012	12/5/2012	1	-
4	Dghflsn5nH	5/11/2012	5/13/2012	2	-	5/16/2012	5/29/2012	13	-			-	-			-	-
5	EdAyyLIB5d	2/5/2012	2/6/2012	1	-	4/29/2012	5/3/2012	4	-	5/28/2012	5/31/2012	3	-	10/15/2012	10/16/2012	1	-
6	loirzTSBm4	9/3/2012	9/4/2012	1	-	9/18/2012	9/21/2012	3	-			-	-			-	-
7	BIYfQRS5Cm	2/5/2012	2/6/2012	1	-	6/10/2012	6/11/2012	1	-	6/14/2012	6/28/2012	14	-			-	-
8	7ZhOt9B6uS	6/14/2012	6/16/2012	2	-	12/2/2012	12/4/2012	2	-			-	-			-	-
9	6CnwkJ62z	9/14/2012	9/17/2012	3	-			-	-			-	-			-	-
10	KCxDXs35DQ	6/16/2012	6/29/2012	13	-			-	-			-	-			-	-
11	2vHZqsl5Ch	3/27/2012	4/9/2012	13	-	5/15/2012	5/18/2012	3	-			-	-			-	-
12	NIBSFBn6wL	8/22/2012	9/5/2012	14	-			-	-			-	-			-	-
13	5wlr2Co5px	6/20/2012	6/23/2012	3	-	7/17/2012	7/18/2012	1	-	7/31/2012	8/1/2012	1	-	8/1/2012	8/14/2012	13	-
14	DnUVru0FMr	11/15/2012	11/24/2012	9	-	11/25/2012	11/30/2012	5	-			-	-			-	-

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

List the youth who have been admitted to your RBS program since implementation and show how they have moved through the various stages of your program thus far (e.g. from the residential group care component, to "bridge" foster care, to reunification or another form of permanency).

Non-Profit Corporation Name: Hathaway-Sycamores Program Number: Contact Person: Telephone Number: Date Completed: Period Covered: Activity through..... 12/31/2012

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S
Youth Enrolled		RBS Residential Group Care				RBS Community-Based "Bridge" Foster Care						RBS Aftercare in Permanent Placement, including Reunification				CURRENT STATUS		
Use Youth's Foreign Client Key Only; List in order of Date of Admission		Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Group Care, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In "Bridge" Foster Care, Total Days To Date	Number of RBS "Bridge" Foster Care Placements To Date	Did Child Incur Episodes For Crisis Stabilization?	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Aftercare or a Permanent Care Total Days To Date	Use Current Status Codes Below	For CLOSED Cases ONLY, Total Days In RBS	For OPEN Cases ONLY, Total Days In RBS
1	Tr25Ug11AE	11/16/2012		-	45			-	-					-	-	1	-	45
2	5w1r2Co5pX	11/8/2012		-	53			-	-					-	-	1	-	53
3	GWNKugP5Dk	10/19/2012		-	73			-	-					-	-	1	-	73
4	TETG5ZHFhR	9/26/2012		-	96			-	-					-	-	1	-	96
5	NieP11C199	8/7/2012		-	146			-	-					-	-	1	-	146
6	215hGEe5Co	8/3/2012		-	150			-	-					-	-	1	-	150
7	AXJT6nh5Dk	7/9/2012		-	175			-	-					-	-	1	-	175
8	6jauUy34qv	May-12	11/2/2012	156	-			-	-			11/2/2012		-	59	3	-	215
9	BZaIvYyDuO	4/13/2012	7/1/2012	79	-			-	-			7/1/2012	10/18/2012	109	-	4	188	-
10	Grq1PBGCOB	5/18/2012		-	227			-	-					-	-	1	-	227
11	0qwKIm16V9	5/17/2012		-	228			-	-					-	-	1	-	228
12	SBBFthTCOq	4/24/2012		-	251			-	-					-	-	1	-	251
13	6OFHXfIBm5	4/18/2012		-	257			-	-					-	-	1	-	257
14	2ZWotbn5DU	4/4/2012		-	271			-	-					-	-	1	-	271
15	CFXLrT58kF	4/3/2012		-	272			-	-					-	-	1	-	272
16	67cNEaAC1E	2/7/2012	1/3/2013	331	-			-	-					-	-	1	-	331
17	StwxMRd1M7	5/20/2011	4/25/2012	341	-			-	-					-	-	6	341	-
18	Tht61Ew5Fe	7/7/2011	7/11/2011	4	-			-	-			7/11/2011	5/25/2012	319	-	4	323	-
19	5Rd6v17AKU	7/20/2011	4/9/2012	264	-			-	-			4/9/2012		-	266	3	-	530
20	SyOeLQEOUe	7/15/2011	3/27/2012	256	-			-	-					-	-	6	256	-
21	hJNL1zk4y1	11/27/2011	3/9/2012	103	-			-	-			3/9/2012	9/7/2012	182	-	4	285	-
22	JstJJeIm4y1	9/15/2011	3/9/2012	176	-			-	-			3/9/2012	9/7/2012	182	-	4	358	-
23	8K90ZfUBm5	10/3/2011	11/2/2012	396	-			-	-			11/2/2012		-	59	3	-	455
24	Ky91Wwa5Ch	10/7/2011	2/2/2012	118	-			-	-			2/2/2012		-	333	3	-	451
25	E5fn5MN6HI	10/12/2011	4/11/2012	182	-			-	-	y		4/11/2012	11/7/2012	210	-	4	392	-
26	JAGgAfV9A4	10/25/2011	9/24/2012	335	-			-	-					-	-	6	335	-
27	0uweVxz5dE	11/17/2011	1/13/2012	57	-	10/9/2012		-	83	1				-	-	2	-	410
28	I2rUI2Z76g	11/27/2011		-	400	1/13/2012	5/4/2012	112	-	1				-	-	6	159	-
29	RK1jIjC195	11/4/2011	5/4/2012	182	-			-	-			5/4/2012	6/25/2012	52	-	1	-	234
	BXL1jIjC195	6/25/2012		-	189			-	-	y				-	-	1	-	189
30	Ld19vgrDe2	12/22/2011		-	375			-	-					-	-	1	-	375
31	Mm87FzxB3q	12/7/2010	9/2/2011	269	-			-	-			5/13/2011	7/10/2012	424	-	4	424	-
32	EcK4JTs5Fr	12/7/2010	9/2/2011	269	-	9/2/2011	12/27/2011	116	-	1				-	-	1	-	385
	EcK4JTs5Fr	12/27/2011	6/22/2012	178	-	6/26/2012		-	188	1 y				-	-	2	-	466
33	ABRQapO191	12/2/2010	9/22/2011	294	-			-	-			9/22/2011	4/26/2012	217	-	4	511	-
34	9LuumHfC1F	12/2/2010	11/4/2011	337	-			-	-			11/4/2011	10/16/2012	347	-	4	684	-
35	96olygY9Ma	12/2/2010	9/13/2011	285	-	9/13/2011	1/6/2012	115	-	1				-	-	6	400	-
36	0qu1NT8195	12/2/2010	9/16/2011	288	-			-	-			9/16/2011	10/2/2012	382	-	4	670	-
37	Mm87FzxB3q	12/2/2010	7/18/2011	228	-			-	-			7/18/2011	7/6/2012	354	-	4	582	-
38	0cmdyMQ1tm	12/2/2010	9/16/2011	288	-			-	-			9/19/2011	2/16/2012	150	-	1	-	438
	0cmdyMQ1tm	2/16/2012	7/25/2012	160	-			-	-	y		7/25/2012	10/9/2012	76	-	6	236	-
39	RFqDZ8s9Vh	12/21/2010	5/22/2012	518	-			-	-					-	-	6	518	-
40	U1SQTVV0Yt	12/7/2010	9/22/2011	289	-			-	-			9/22/2011	9/22/2012	366	-	4	655	-
41	NExguPT0ZX	12/7/2010	5/19/2012	529	-			-	-					-	-	4	529	-

Current Status Codes:

- 1 RBS Case Open with Youth in Residential Group Care
- 2 RBS Case Open with Youth in "Bridge" Foster Care
- 3 RBS Case Open with Youth in Permanent Placement with RBS Aftercare Services
- 4 RBS Case Closed: Graduation
- 5 RBS Case Closed: Exit before Graduation due to Emancipation
- 6 RBS Case Closed: Exit before Graduation for Reason other than Emancipation
- 7 RBS Case Closed: Voluntary Closure
- 8 RBS Case Closed: AB 3632 Eligibility Ends

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

List the youth who have had a Crisis Stabilization episode during the report period and show the number of days in each placement per episode. (The total number of days a client spends in Crisis Stabilization runs concurrently and is included in the total number of days in the Community component the youth was in when the Crisis Stabilization episode occurred).

Non-Profit Corp. Name: Hathaway-Sycamores **Program Number:** _____ **Contact Person:** _____
Period Covered: Activity through..... 12/31/2012 **Telephone Number:** _____ **Date Completed:** _____

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
Youth Enrolled		#1 RBS CRISIS STABILIZATION PLACEMENT				#2 RBS CRISIS STABILIZATION PLACEMENT				#3 RBS CRISIS STABILIZATION PLACEMENT			
Use Youth's Foreign Client Key Only; List in order of Date of Admission		Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Crisis Stabilization, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Crisis Stabilization, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Crisis Stabilization, Total Days To Date
1	E5fn5MN6HI	9/23/2012	9/26/2012	3	-			-	-			-	-
2	U1SQTVV0Yt	3/27/2012	4/10/2012	14	-			-	-			-	-
3	0cmdyMQ1tm	8/16/2012	8/21/2012	5	-			-	-			-	-
4	RX1ji-jC195	5/23/2012	5/31/2012	8	-	6/16/2012	6/25/2012	9	-			-	-
5	EcK4JTs5Fr	7/14/2012	7/16/2012	2	-	7/30/2012	8/6/2012	7	-	9/5/2012	9/6/2012	1	-
6				-	-			-	-			-	-
7				-	-			-	-			-	-
8				-	-			-	-			-	-
9				-	-			-	-			-	-
10				-	-			-	-			-	-
11				-	-			-	-			-	-
12				-	-			-	-			-	-
13				-	-			-	-			-	-
14				-	-			-	-			-	-
15				-	-			-	-			-	-
16				-	-			-	-			-	-
17				-	-			-	-			-	-
18				-	-			-	-			-	-
19				-	-			-	-			-	-
20				-	-			-	-			-	-
21				-	-			-	-			-	-
22				-	-			-	-			-	-
23				-	-			-	-			-	-
24				-	-			-	-			-	-

List the youth who have been admitted to your RBS program since implementation and show how they have moved through the various stages of your program thus far (e.g. from the residential group care component, to "bridge" foster care, to reunification or another form of permanency).

Non-Profit Corp. Name:		Five Acres				Program Number:				Contact Person: Stacy Spencer								
Period Covered:		Activity through..... 12/31/2012				Telephone Number: 626-798-6793 x2438				Date Completed: 1/2/2013								
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S
Youth Enrolled		RBS Residential Group Care				RBS Community-Based "Bridge" Foster Care						RBS Aftercare in Permanent Placement, including Reunification				CURRENT STATUS		
Use Youth's Foreign Client Key Only; List in order of Date of Admission		Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still in Group Care, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still in "Bridge" Foster Care, Total Days To Date	Number of RBS "Bridge" Foster Care Placements To Date	Did Child Incur Episodes For Crisis Stabilization?	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still in Aftercare or a Permanent Care Total Days To Date	Use Current Status Codes Below	For CLOSED Cases ONLY, Total Days in RBS	For OPEN Cases ONLY, Total Days in RBS
1	QOWX0cSBn5	12/2/2010	8/29/2011	270				-	-	0	no	8/29/2011		-	490	4	625	-
2	SUowMEXHUp	12/2/2010	9/30/2011	302		9/30/2011			458	1	no			-	-	6	411	-
3	DQewFER9Zp	12/2/2010	5/19/2011	168	-	5/19/2011	7/22/2011	64	-	1	no			-	-	-	-	-
	DQewFER9Zp	7/22/2011	3/3/2012	225				-	-	-	no	3/3/2012		-	303	4	715	-
4	D90a6Jw719	12/2/2010	10/29/2011	331	-	10/29/2011	2/3/2012	97	-	1	yes			-	-	6	428	-
5	BppAu5C5DE	12/2/2010	2/21/2012	446	-			-	-	-		2/21/2012		-	314	3	-	760
6	SvITIn10ZX	12/2/2010	6/17/2011	197	-	6/17/2011		563	4	no				-	-	4	719	-
7	S1KLY118SL	12/2/2010	8/9/2011	250	-	8/9/2011	6/8/2012	304	-	1	no	6/8/2012		-	206	4	741	-
8	LCUUK8A5Df	12/2/2010	4/26/2011	145	-	4/26/2011	2/17/2012	297	-	yes				-	-	-	-	-
	LCUUK8A5Df	2/17/2012	4/30/2012	73	-	4/30/2012		245	2	yes				-	-	4	705	-
9	QOI31OJ6bb	12/2/2010	8/18/2011	259	-			-	-	no	8/18/2011			-	-	501	4	578
10	P2EyHLE0Kc	12/2/2010	10/28/2011	330	-	10/28/2011	11/16/2012	384	-	1	yes			-	-	4	715	-
11	JcX9Qtp5Ie	12/2/2010	2/4/2011	64	-			-	-	-		2/4/2011	6/22/2011	138	-	-	-	-
	JcX9Qtp5Ie	6/22/2011	8/30/2011	69	-	8/30/2011		489	1	yes				-	-	2	-	760
12	RTQPh368mF	12/2/2010	11/29/2011	362	-	11/29/2011		398	4	yes				-	-	2	-	760
13	6Y4yUcT1nH	12/2/2010	6/22/2011	202	-			-	-	no	6/22/2011			-	558	4	564	-
14	8fHMIACBn5	12/2/2010	11/10/2011	343	-			-	-	yes	11/10/2011	1/27/2012	78	-	-	6	421	-
15	Fvf7ud2Gsk	12/2/2010	10/7/2011	309	-	10/7/2011		451	1	no				-	-	4	578	-
16	OssadruBKT	2/18/2011	8/16/2012	545	-	8/16/2012		137	1	no				-	-	4	665	-
17	Ctdcw4b5Dk	4/27/2011	6/22/2011	56	-			-	-	no	6/22/2011			-	558	4	418	-
18	SJ3XkGE0Ut	5/20/2011	12/4/2012	564	-			-	-	no	12/4/2012			-	27	3	-	591
19	5oS601P5xD	6/24/2011	9/27/2012	461	-	9/27/2012		95	1	no				-	-	6	-	461
20	6GZp0UDct3	7/7/2011	10/4/2012	455	-	10/4/2012	12/14/2012	71	-	1	no	12/14/2012		-	17	3	-	543
21	QYKXcH5Ds	8/1/2011	6/8/2012	312	-	6/8/2012	12/5/2012	180	-	1	yes			-	-	6	492	-
22	SJuS1Qn1Lh	8/11/2011	8/14/2012	369	-	8/14/2012		139	1	no				-	-	2	-	508
23	FrrRJX05E6	8/23/2011	2/17/2012	178	-			-	-	1	no	2/17/2012	7/14/2012	148	-	2	-	496
24	3qDW4so2KA	9/2/2011	11/9/2012	434	-	11/9/2012		-	-	1	no			-	-	2	-	486
25	D1X7ma6BPK	9/13/2011		-	475			-	-	-				-	-	1	-	475
26	EvXo5Yo5Ch	9/30/2011	8/14/2012	319	-			-	-	1	no			-	-	6	319	-
27	LPJlqxm5TH	10/13/2011	12/21/2012	435	-			-	-	no	12/21/2012			-	10	3	-	445
28	CxZdQ165Cp	10/13/2011	9/19/2012	342	-			-	-	-		9/19/2012	10/15/2012	26	-	6	343	-
29	QXQZMoC1pE	10/28/2011		-	430			-	-	-				-	-	1	-	430
30	6SK1Kgh1Iu	11/10/2011	8/23/2012	287	-			-	-	-		8/23/2012		-	131	3	-	417
31	4OCwzC19A4	11/21/2011	7/9/2012	231	-			-	-	1	no	7/9/2012		-	175	4	343	-
32	QOQ1B1sEgm	11/29/2011	12/13/2012	380	-			-	-	-				-	-	6	380	-
33	RuCL4Mp5yN	2/21/2012	12/20/2012	303	-			-	-	-	12/20/2012			-	11	4	303	-
34	JhbdikP5E6	3/3/2012	8/17/2012	167	-			-	-	-	8/17/2012			-	136	3	-	303
35	K6T0JrvBp1	5/1/2012		-	244			-	-	-				-	-	1	-	244
36	PKNbELH5Dm	6/8/2012		-	206			-	-	-				-	-	1	-	206
37	4QkCaxB0Yt	7/9/2012		-	175			-	-	-				-	-	1	-	175
38	6hd1WxP6eS	8/14/2012		-	139			-	-	-				-	-	1	-	139
39	1wlyNn19R3	8/14/2012	12/18/2012	126	-			-	-	-		12/18/2012		-	13	3	-	139
40	1wlyNn19R3	8/16/2012		-	137			-	-	-				-	-	1	-	137
41	9Lc942gEjz	8/20/2012	11/14/2012	86	-	11/14/2012		47	1	no				-	-	4	106	-
42	9mXGE1YCOk	8/28/2012		-	125			-	-	-				-	-	1	-	125
43	2esBub79A4	9/20/2012		-	102			-	-	-				-	-	1	-	102
44	NuBBJ4BCQR	9/27/2012		-	95			-	-	-				-	-	1	-	95
45	Im3et4b7YS	10/5/2012		-	87			-	-	-				-	-	1	-	87
46	EBWDSFm5D1	11/9/2012		-	52			-	-	-				-	-	1	-	52
47	Gg5fwvn7vm	11/15/2012	12/7/2012	22	-			-	-	-		12/7/2012		-	24	3	-	46
48	M7TdHrJ7I2	12/5/2012		-	26			-	-	-				-	-	1	-	26
49	Sg2I6bA2AW	12/10/2012		-	21			-	-	-				-	-	1	-	21
50	OwrjH1b2Br	12/17/2012		-	14			-	-	-				-	-	1	-	14
51	8Qf0g5z9cK	12/21/2012		-	10			-	-	-				-	-	1	-	10
52	QoJv8Av5TH	12/31/2012		-	1			-	-	-				-	-	1	-	1

- 1 RBS Case Open with Youth in Residential Group Care
- 2 RBS Case Open with Youth in "Bridge" Foster Care
- 3 RBS Case Open with Youth in Permanent Placement with RBS Aftercare Services
- 4 RBS Case Closed: Graduation
- 5 RBS Case Closed: Exit before Graduation due to Emancipation
- 6 RBS Case Closed: Exit before Graduation for Reason other than Emancipation
- 7 RBS Case Closed: Voluntary Closure
- 8 RBS Case Closed: AB 3632 Eligibility Ends

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

List the youth who have had a Crisis Stabilization episode during the report period and show the number of days in each placement per episode. (The total number of days a client spends in Crisis Stabilization runs concurrently and is included in the total number of days in the Community component the youth was in when the Crisis Stabilization episode occurred).

Non-Profit Corp. Name: Five Acres **Program Number:** **Contact Person:** Stacy Spencer
Period Covered: Activity through..... 12/31/2012 **Telephone Number:** **Date Completed:** 626-798-6793 x2438

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
Youth Enrolled		#1 RBS CRISIS STABILIZATION PLACEMENT				#2 RBS CRISIS STABILIZATION PLACEMENT				#3 RBS CRISIS STABILIZATION PLACEMENT			
Use Youth's Foreign Client Key Only; List in order of Date of Admission		Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Crisis Stabilization, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Crisis Stabilization, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Crisis Stabilization, Total Days To Date
1	D90a6Jw719	1/13/2012	1/16/2012	3	-	1/19/2012	2/2/2012	14	-			-	-
2	BppAu5C5DE	8/20/2012	8/26/2012	6	-			-	-			-	-
3	LCUUK8A5Df	1/9/2012	1/13/2012	4	-	1/17/2012	1/20/2012	3	-	1/23/2012	2/2/2012	10	-
	LCUUK8A5Df	2/5/2012	2/10/2012	5	-	2/13/2012	2/16/2012	3	-	8/16/2012	8/21/2012	5	-
4	P2EyHLE0kC	7/22/2012	7/23/2012	1	-	9/13/2012	9/19/2012	6	-	9/22/2012	10/4/2012	12	-
	P2EyHLE0kC	10/5/2012	10/17/2012	12	-	10/20/2012	10/31/2012	11	-	11/2/2012	11/14/2012	12	-
	P2EyHLE0kC	11/15/2012	11/16/2012	1	-			-	-			-	-
5	JcX9QTP5Ie	3/23/2012	3/25/2012	2	-	6/21/2012	6/22/2012	1	-			-	-
6	RTQPh368mF	4/12/2012	4/13/2012	1	-	6/14/2012	6/20/2012	6	-	6/22/2012	6/28/2012	6	-
	RTQPh368mF	7/30/2012	8/13/2012	14	-	9/7/2012	9/21/2012	14	-	12/26/2012	1/3/2013	8	-
7	8fHMiACBn5	1/4/2012	1/13/2012	9	-	1/14/2012	1/27/2012	13	-			-	-
8	QYKCXeH5Ds	9/14/2012	9/16/2012	2	-	9/25/2012	9/30/2012	5	-			-	-
	QYKCXeH5Ds	10/12/2012	10/15/2012	3	-	10/26/2012	10/29/2012	3	-	11/10/2012	11/20/2012	10	-
	QYKCXeH5Ds	11/21/2012	12/4/2012	13	-			-	-			-	-
9	JhbdikP5E6	11/15/2012	11/16/2012	1	-			-	-			-	-